

Network Working Group
Internet-Draft
Intended status: Best Current Practice
Expires: October 11, 2020

B. Leiba
FutureWei Technologies
April 9, 2020

Specifying the IANA Contact for Registrations in IETF Documents
draft-leiba-ietf-iana-registrations-00

Abstract

IETF documents have been inconsistent in what they specify as the registrant (or contact, or change controller) in IANA registrations they make. This document provides a consistent specification ("IETF") to be used, and allows for exceptions with IESG approval.

Status of This Memo

This Internet-Draft is submitted in full conformance with the provisions of [BCP 78](#) and [BCP 79](#).

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts. The list of current Internet-Drafts is at <https://datatracker.ietf.org/drafts/current/>.

Internet-Drafts are draft documents valid for a maximum of six months and may be updated, replaced, or obsoleted by other documents at any time. It is inappropriate to use Internet-Drafts as reference material or to cite them other than as "work in progress."

This Internet-Draft will expire on October 11, 2020.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2020 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

This document is subject to [BCP 78](#) and the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents (<https://trustee.ietf.org/license-info>) in effect on the date of publication of this document. Please review these documents carefully, as they describe your rights and restrictions with respect to this document. Code Components extracted from this document must include Simplified BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as described in the Simplified BSD License.

1. Introduction

IETF documents have been inconsistent in what they specify as the registrant (or contact, or change controller) in IANA registrations they make. Sometimes "IETF" is used, sometimes "IESG"; sometimes a working group is named, and sometimes individuals (usually the document authors) are used. There are even some that specify the IETF Chair.

So as to provide some consistency, this document gives a preferred specification, while allowing exceptions when there are good reasons for making them.

2. Specifying Registrant Information

When a document coming from an IETF working group makes an IANA request that specifies registrant information (including such things as "contact", "owner", "change controller", and similar fields), "IETF" is to be used, as the registration is coming from the IETF as a whole via IETF consensus on the document. If contact information is specified, the working group mailing list would normally be used. If there is a relevant review list or other IETF mailing list that covers the technology, that can be used instead.

For example:

Registrant contact: IETF <examplewg@ietf.org>

Change controller: IETF <examplewg@ietf.org>

When a document coming from an individual submitter makes an IANA request that specifies registrant information, "IETF" is to be used, as these registrations also come from the IETF as a whole via IETF last call consensus. If contact information is specified and there are relevant mailing lists as outlined above, one of those lists would normally be used, with the assent of the working group chairs or list owners. If there is no relevant working group, a relevant directorate or area-wide mailing list is the next choice, with the assent of the Area Directors. In cases where neither of those options applies, the document authors or the IESG itself can be used as contact information.

In any case, contact information will not be published in the RFC. IANA will record the contact information and the RFC Editor will remove the email addresses during final editing. This allows IANA to update the recorded contact information when email addresses change or disappear, and avoids putting mutable email addresses into immutable RFCs.

As there could be good reasons to vary from these policies in some situations, the IESG always has the authority to approve sensible exceptions. Working group chairs or document authors should discuss proposed exceptions with the responsible Area Director when such situations arise, and such exceptions should be called out in the document shepherd writeup.

See [BCP 26](#) [[RFC8126](#)] for additional information about IANA registrations.

3. IANA Considerations

IANA is asked to check compliance with this and to ask the responsible AD in cases where this practice is not followed.

4. Security Considerations

This document is purely procedural, and there are no related security considerations.

5. Informative References

[RFC8126] Cotton, M., Leiba, B., and T. Narten, "Guidelines for Writing an IANA Considerations Section in RFCs", [BCP 26](#), [RFC 8126](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8126, June 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8126>>.

Author's Address

Barry Leiba
FutureWei Technologies

Phone: +1 914 433 2749
Email: barryleiba@computer.org
URI: <http://internetmessagingtechnology.org/>

